

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
April 25, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group on April 25, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	On-site Survey
Attachment 5	Follow-up Mail-in Survey
Attachment 6	Telephone Survey

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

### **Action Items – March 26, 2002 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the March 26, 2002 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #R45:** Research project documents to find references on how collaborative interaction will be used in the relicensing process.
- Status: The Facilitator researched this issue and found references to the collaborative process in several project documents, including, but not limited to, process protocols, the Initial Information Package (IIP), and Scoping Document 1 (SD-1). One participant suggested reviewing documents from the Mokelumne River relicensing project for a clear description of the collaborative process in FERC relicensing efforts. It was noted that these documents were available on FERC's website, for any interested party to review.
- Action Item #R46:** Coordinate with David Rolloff on the potential to develop a formal hiring process to involve local residents in the recreation survey implementation process.
- Status: David Rolloff (Harza/EDAW) described the hiring process associated with the implementation of the recreation surveys for the project. Job advertisements were placed in four different local/regional newspapers and over 60 inquiries were received. For the most part, respondents were from the Oroville area and generally very qualified. The consultant team is in the process of reviewing resumes, making initial phone calls, and arranging interviews. The hiring process will be finalized next week.
- Action Item #R46:** Consult with DPR on the availability of the 2002 statewide recreation survey data for use in the Work Group.

Status:

Doug Rischbieter (DWR) has consulted with DPR and was informed that the 2002 survey data will be available for use in the relicensing process. However, due to budget constraints, the survey may be smaller than originally intended. Doug R. intends to follow-up with DPR periodically to track the progress of this survey effort.

### **Study Plan Task Force Update**

Doug Rischbieter (DWR) led the discussion updating the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group on the progress of the Study Plan Task Force, specifically their progress on finalizing SP-R13. The participants were informed that SP-R13 has been finalized with only minor text changes made at the Task Force meeting. These changes were not included in the electronic version available to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group for review; therefore, these changes were discussed and made “real-time” to the electronic version of the study plan by the Facilitator. The edits consisted mainly of clarifying survey locations and user groups. After these edits were made, SP-R13 was considered finalized by the participants. The Facilitator noted that the study plan could be adjusted after Year 1 if necessary.

### **Survey Instruments**

Tom Wegge (TCW Economics) led the discussion on the proposed survey instruments to be administered as part of SP-R13. Three survey instruments have been developed: (1) an on-site survey, (2) a follow-up mail survey (to the on-site survey participants), and (3) a household phone survey and are provided as part of this summary as attachments 4, 5, and 6, respectively. The development of the survey instruments is an iterative process that includes pre-testing of the instruments. As part of the pre-testing process, the three survey instruments were administered to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. The participants were asked to complete the surveys, based on the user profiles provided, and note any questions/comments they have directly on the surveys. The consultant team intends to review all written questions/comments noted by the participants, as well as any issues raised during the meeting.

After completion of the three survey instruments, the participants discussed each instrument individually. The major issues raised on the on-site survey included the structure of the survey, the bias toward lake anglers (relative to stream anglers), the ability of respondents to reliably answer specific fish species questions (specifically wild vs. hatchery), the terminology used to describe “conflict”/“interaction” between user groups, development of separate questionnaire sections for different user groups, the inclusion of general questions related to the users’ overall recreation experience, and the use of a sliding-scale vs. yes/no questions.

The mail survey is a follow-up survey sent to those that filled out the on-site survey discussed above. Issues raised by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group associated with this survey instrument include consistency of the presentation of regional recreational opportunity locations (across all survey instruments), survey layout, the distinction between the quantity vs. quality of recreational experiences, and the desire to include operation-related questions (e.g., law enforcement, staffing, etc.).

The last survey instrument discussed was the telephone survey. The main issue raised by the participants on this survey related to the event and facility lists included in survey questions intended to solicit whether these items would motivate the respondent to visit the Lake Oroville area more often. There were concerns that these lists could influence responses received from survey respondents. Items raised by participants that will be considered for inclusion in the survey include, but are not limited to, promotional fishing opportunities, natural history events, outdoor theatre/concerts, ADA facilities, general public access, winterized floating campsites, rental stable, guided equestrian trails, an equestrian event arena, and separate horse/bike trails. There was a

consensus among the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that what is included in the survey should be based on regional recreational trends.

### **Next Steps**

The consulting team will review the questions/comments raised during the April 2002 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting, and consider them during further refinement of the three recreation survey instruments. Based on the implementation schedule for the various recreation/socioeconomic study plans, the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to cancel the May 2002 meeting to allow the consulting team and DWR staff more time to prepare for the start of the data collection season. The consulting team agreed to provide an update on the Memorial Day holiday data collection efforts at the June Work Group meeting. The next regularly scheduled Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting is:

Date: June 27, 2002  
Time: 6 – 10pm  
Location: Kelly Ridge Meeting Room

One participant suggested that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group hold their next meeting at one of the project area recreation facilities; there was general consensus that this would be a good idea and DWR agreed to explore this option further.

### **Agreements Made**

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to cancel its May 2002 meeting.

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

**Action Item #R48:** Research the potential to re-allow public parking along the dam road and potential to re-open the overlook parking lot.

**Responsible:** Eric See (DWR)  
**Due Date:** June 27, 2002

**Action Item #R49:** Update Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group on Memorial Day holiday data collection efforts.

**Responsible:** DWR/Consulting Team  
**Due Date:** June 27, 2002